



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/400,507	09/21/1999	MARK ANTHONY CESARE	ST9-99-034	3492

24033 7590 12/22/2003

KONRAD RAYNES VICTOR & MANN, LLP
315 SOUTH BEVERLY DRIVE
SUITE 210
BEVERLY HILLS, CA 90212

EXAMINER

FLEURANTIN, JEAN B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2172

16

DATE MAILED: 12/22/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Page

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/400,507	CESARE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jean B Fleurantin	2172	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 September 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 5,6,13,14,19,20 and 27 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4,7-12,15-18 and 21-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
 1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
 * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
 a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>15</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 2172

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Claims 1-27 remain pending for examination.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The information disclosure statement (IDS) filed on November 04, 2003 (Paper No. 15) complies with the provision of M.P.E.P. 609. It has been placed in the application file. The information referred to therein has been considered as to the merits.

Response to Applicant's Remarks

3. Applicant's arguments, see pages 2-7, filed on August 27, 2003 with respect to the rejection (s) of claims 1-27 under U.S.C. 103(a) have been considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection over US Patent No. 6,298,342 issued to Graefe et al.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4, 7-12, 15-18 and 21-26 are rejected under U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,298,342 issued to Graefe et al. ("hereinafter Graefe").

As per claims 1 and 17, Graefe discloses, "a method for transforming data in an input table in a database in a server in communication with a client" as a pivot operation for transforming the rows and columns of a table, in which the operation accepts and input table, (see col. 3, lines 7-12), "receiving from the client a transform command indicating an input data table name in the database" as means for processing a query transmitted from any of the client application 210, in which the records from the input table which appears in the output, (see col. 5, lines 46-67),

"accessing a copy of the input table from the database" as means for sequencing accesses to the records of stored database tables, (see col. 6, lines 12-13). Further, in column 3, lines 11-12, Graefe discloses the operation accepts and input table and a pivot specification and produces an output. Graefe does not explicitly disclose one rule indicating at least one cell in the input table to transform and a transform operation to perform with respect to the at least one cell; and transforming, within the server, data in the accessed input table according to each rule specified

Art Unit: 2172

in the transform command. However, it is well known in the art that to apply rule specified in the transform command. On the other hand, Graefe discloses the functions in relational algebra consume one or more input tables and produce an output table according to a rule, (see col. 7, 11-18), and column 10, lines 57-66. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Graefe with one rule indicating at least one cell in the input table to transform and a transform operation to perform with respect to the at least one cell; and transforming, within the server, data in the accessed input table according to each rule specified in the transform command. Such modification would allow the teachings of Graefe to improve the performance and reliability of the method and system program and data structure for transforming database, and to provide a pivot operation for transforming the rows and columns of a table, (see col. 3, lines 7-9).

As per claims 2, 10 and 26, in addition to the discussion in claim 1, Graefe further discloses, “wherein the client is a client computer that communicates with the server over a network” as server software for distribution and downloading to client and another medium, (see col. 4, lines 53-55).

As per claims 3 and 11, Graefe discloses, “wherein the client is an application program executing in the server” as client software for distribution and downloading to client and another medium, (see col. 4, lines 53-55).

As per claims 4, 12, 18 and 23, in addition to the discussion in claim 1, Graefe further discloses, “wherein an application of a subsequent transform operation following a previous transform operation on one cell transforms previously transformed data in the cell” as a pivot operation for transforming the rows and columns of a table as that terms defined in a relational database, in which the operation accepts and input table, (see col. 3, lines 7-20).

As per claims 7 and 15, in addition to the discussion in claim 1, Graefe further discloses, “whereby the transform command executes in the server independently of the client” as an external storage medium which may store client and server software for distribution and downloading to client and another medium, (see col. 4, lines 53-55).

As per claims 8, 16, 21 and 25, Graefe disclosed the claimed subject matter except the claimed wherein the transform command further comprises multiple rules, wherein each rule specifies at least one column in the input table and at least one transform operation to perform on each specified column in the input table, wherein at least two rules specify different columns in the input table and different transform operations to apply to each specified. However, it is well known in the art to apply rule specified in the transform. On the other hand, Graefe discloses the functions in relational algebra consume one or more input tables and produce an output table according to a rule, (see col. 7, 11-18), and column 10, lines 57-66. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Graefe with one rule indicating at least one cell in the input table to transform and a transform operation to perform with respect to the at least one cell; and transforming, within the server,

data in the accessed input table according to each rule specified in the transform command. Such modification would allow the teachings of Graefe to improve the performance and reliability of the method and system program and data structure for transforming database, and to provide a pivot operation for transforming the rows and columns of a table, (see col. 3, lines 7-9).

As per claim 9, Graefe discloses, “a system for transforming data” as a pivot operation for transforming the rows and columns of a table, (see col. 3, lines 7-9), “a client process” (see figure 1, col. 4, lines 38-39);

“server including a database and an input table in communication with the client process” (see figure 1, col. 4, lines 38-44); “program logic implemented in the server” as server software for distribution and downloading to client, (see col. 4, lines 53-55), comprising:

“means for receiving from the client a transform command indicating an input data table name in the database” as means for processing a query transmitted from any of the client application 210, in which the records from the input table which appears in the output, (see col. 5, lines 46-67),

“means for accessing a copy of the input table from the database” as means for sequencing accesses to the records of stored database tables, (see col. 6, lines 12-13). Further, in column 3, lines 11-12, Graefe discloses the operation accepts an input table and a pivot specification and produces an output. Graefe does not explicitly disclose one rule indicating at least one cell in the input table to transform and a transform operation to perform with respect to the at least one cell; and transforming, within the server, data in the accessed input table according to each rule specified in the transform command. However, it is well known in the art

to apply rule specified in the transform command. On the other hand, Graefe discloses the functions in relational algebra consume one or more input tables and produce an output table according to a rule, (see col. 7, 11-18), and column 10, lines 57-66. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Graefe with one rule indicating at least one cell in the input table to transform and a transform operation to perform with respect to the at least one cell; and transforming, within the server, data in the accessed input table according to each rule specified in the transform command. Such modification would allow the teachings of Graefe to improve the performance and reliability of the method and system program and data structure for transforming database, and to provide a pivot operation for transforming the rows and columns of a table, (see col. 3, lines 7-9).

As per claim 22, Graefe discloses, “a memory device including a command for reforming transforming a transform operation on a computer database input table” as a pivot operation for transforming the rows and columns of a table, in which the operation accepts and input table, (see col. 3, lines 7-12), the command comprising “an input table name parameter indicating the input table subject to the transform operation” as means for processing a query transmitted from any of the client application 210, in which the records from the input table which appears in the output, (see col. 5, lines 46-67),

“wherein the transform command is executed to access a copy of the input table from the database” as means for sequencing accesses to the records of stored database tables, (see col. 6, lines 12-13). Further, in column 3, lines 11-12, Graefe discloses the operation accepts and input table and a pivot specification and produces an output,

“wherein the command is transmitted from a client to a server” as client software for distribution and downloading to client and another medium, (see col. 4, lines 53-55). Graefe does not explicitly disclose at least one rule indicating at least one cell in the input table to transform and a transform operation to perform with respect to the at least one cell, transforming data in the access input table according to each rule specified in the transform command, wherein the server processes the command to transform data in the input table according to each rule in the transform command. However, it is well known in the art to apply rule specified in the transform command. On the other hand, Graefe discloses the functions in relational algebra consume one or more input tables and produce an output table according to a rule, (see col. 7, 11-18), and column 10, lines 57-66. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Graefe with one rule indicating at least one cell in the input table to transform and a transform operation to perform with respect to the at least one cell; and transforming, within the server, data in the accessed input table according to each rule specified in the transform command. Such modification would allow the teachings of Graefe to improve the performance and reliability of the method and system program and data structure for transforming database, and to provide a pivot operation for transforming the rows and columns of a table, (see col. 3, lines 7-9).

Art Unit: 2172

As per claim 24, in addition to the discussion in claim 22, Graefe further discloses, "wherein the transformed input table is written to the output table if the transform command indicates the output table" (col. 3, lines 11-12), and "wherein the input table in the database is updated with the transformed input table if the transform command does not indicate one output table" (see cols. 4-5, lines 60-7).

Allowable Subject Matter

5. Claims 5-6, 13-14, 19-20 and 27 are allowed.

The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

The present application has been thoroughly reviewed. Upon extensive diverse databases searches, and a full review of applicant arguments, the examiner deems that the claimed features "writing the transformed input table data to the database in the server after performing all transform operations specified in the rules of the transform command against the accessing input table" in conjunction with other elements of the independent claims would not found anticipated or obvious over the prior art made of record. Therefore, claims 5-6, 13-14, 19-20 and 27 are hereby allowed.

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Witkowski US Patent Number 6,370,524 relates to computer database systems.

Contact Information

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication from examiner should be directed to Jean Bolte Fleurantin at (703) 308-6718. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 7:30 A.M. to 6:00 P.M.

If any attempt to reach the examiner by telephone is unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. BREENE JOHN E can be reached at (703) 305-9790. The FAX phone numbers for the Group 2100 Customer Service Center are: *After Final* (703) 746-7238, *Official* (703) 746-7239, and *Non-Official* (703) 746-7240. NOTE: Documents transmitted by facsimile will be entered as official documents on the file wrapper unless clearly marked "***DRAFT***".

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group 2100 Customer Service Center receptionist whose telephone numbers are (703) 306-5631, (703) 306-5632, (703) 306-5633.



Jean Bolte Fleurantin

2003-12-08